

**REMARKS**

The indication of allowable subject matter in claims 11-24 and 31-35 is noted with appreciation. It is respectfully submitted that the other pending claims are also allowable, for at least the reasons set forth below. Favorable reconsideration of the present patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In this Amendment claims 45-54 are added, claims 6-8, 15-17, 24, 29, 35 and 43-44 are canceled and claims 25, 37-39 and 41-44 are amended. As a result, claims 1-14, 18-21, 25-26, 30-32 and 36-54 are now pending in the application.

In the Office Action of April 19, 2006, claims 32-40 are objected to due to a typographical error in the claim numbering. Claims 1-3, 6, 10, 25-26, 29-30, 40-41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent 5,911,119 (Bartholomew) further in view of U.S. Patent 5,708,701 (Houvig). Claims 4-5, 7-9, 27-28, 42 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Bartholomew further in view of Houvig and yet further in view of U.S. Patent 6,741,162 (Sacca). Claims 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Bartholomew further in view of Paret. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Bartholomew further in view of Paret and yet further in view of Sacca. Claims 11-24 and 31-35 are indicated to be allowable.

*Claim Numbering Objection*

The Office Action mentions that the Office has renumbered the last nine claims to correct a typographical error in numbering the originally filed claims. The present Amendment attends

to the dependency error caused by this typographical error in the numbering of the original claims. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

*35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection in view of Bartholomew and Houvig*

The §103(a) rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 10, 25-26, 30, 40-41 and 43 is respectfully traversed. (Claim 29 is canceled).

The present application notes that it is often difficult to key in data using a telephone keypad, especially alphanumeric data as needed for the address book information or email addresses. The tiny keyboard of a telephone and methods of reusing the various number keys for entry of alphanumeric characters simply make it difficult and time consuming to enter names, addresses, email addresses and other contact information or network data. Various embodiments of the present invention overcome these disadvantages of the conventional systems.

By using the present invention, network data can be sent over a power line to a portable phone by way of the power output connection which is connected to the portable phone. For example, when the portable phone is sitting in its cradle (or connected to a power cable) being recharged network data (e.g., alphanumeric characters such as email addresses or contact information) may be sent to the portable phone via the power connector from a home computer or other information processing device.

The Bartholomew patent cited in the Office Action concerns a cordless telephone system which uses the power lines (e.g., AC power lines) of a building to connect a number of portable phone cradles to a base unit. The system described in Bartholomew sends telephone call signals via the building's power lines to a phone cradle, which in turn sends wireless signals to the phone

handset it self. The Bartholomew patent does not describe sending data signals via a power coupling circuit to the phone. The Office Action acknowledges a number of claim features not taught by Bartholomew. The Office Action then cites the Houvig patent to purportedly overcome the deficiencies of Bartholomew.

The Houvig patent involves a power line telephone communication system which sends selected information contained in an incoming call to the portable telephone via the power lines. For example, the Houvig patent can send caller ID information of an incoming call to the portable telephone so that a user can see who is calling before taking the portable phone off hook. While the Houvig patent does send signals via the power lines, it should be noted that the signals are call information signals (e.g., caller ID information) rather than data signals. Therefore, the Houvig patent does not disclose “said power line networking interface connected to said output power coupling circuit … to send data signals to said portable phone,” as recited in claim 1 and in claim 25. The Houvig patent also does not disclose “a first means for modulating/demodulating a networking signal through said means for coupling to power line” as recited in claim 36, or “a power line networking interface connected to said power line networking signal coupling circuit adapted to … send power line networking signals to said power line input” as recited in claim 40.

Accordingly, the Bartholomew patent and the Houvig patent, either taken separately or taken together as a hypothetical combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

*§103 Rejections in view of various combinations of  
Bartholomew / Houvig / Sacca and Paret*

The §103(a) rejection of claims 4-5, 7-9, 42 and 44 in view of the hypothetical combination of Bartholomew, Houvig and Sacca is respectfully traversed. (Claims 27-28 are canceled). The §103(a) rejection of claims 36-37 in view of the hypothetical combination of Bartholomew and Paret is respectfully traversed. The §103(a) rejection of claim 38 in view of the hypothetical combination of Bartholomew, Paret and Sacca is respectfully traversed.

The Sacca patent is relied upon to show various coupling capacitors and isolation transformers. Without addressing the merits of whether or not the Sacca patent teaches the features for which it is relied upon in the Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that Sacca does not overcome the deficiencies of Bartholomew and Houvig discussed above. Accordingly, it is submitted that Bartholomew, Houvig and Sacca, either taken singly or as a hypothetical combination, does not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4-5, 7-9, 42 and 44 is requested.

Regarding the Paret patent, this patent is relied upon in the Office Action to show a first means for modulating/demodulating a networking signal ... housed within a housing and a second means for modulating/demodulating a networking signal ... housed within a housing. However, as with the Bartholomew and Houvig discussed above, while the Paret system does send signals along power lines, it should be noted that the signals are call information signals (e.g., caller ID information) rather than networking signals. Therefore, the Paret patent does not disclose “a first means for modulating/demodulating a networking signal through said means for coupling to power line, said first means for modulating/demodulating a networking signal substantially housed within said means for housing; and a second means for modulating/

demodulating a networking signal through said means for coupling to said one of said at least one output voltage, said second means for modulating/demodulating said networking signal substantially housed within said means for housing," as recited in claim 36.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Bartholomew, Houvig and Paret, either taken singly or as a hypothetical combination, does not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 36-37 is requested.

*Deposit Account Authorization / Provisional Time Extension Petition*

It is believed that no extension of time is necessary, and no claim fees are due (since more claims were canceled in the Amendment than added). However, to the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-0439 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. However, in the event there are any unresolved issues, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact applicant's representative, Scott Richardson, by telephone at (571) 748-4765 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott Charles Richardson  
Reg. No. 43,436

McGrath, Geissler, Olds & Richardson, PLLC  
P.O. Box 7085  
Alexandria, VA 22307

**Date: July 19, 2006**